

973.18  
St32f

Francis Borgia Steck, O.F.M. Father  
Garraghan and "The Jolliet-Marquette —  
Expedition, 1673." (1929)

ILLINOIS HISTORICAL SURVEY

# ILLINOIS HISTORICAL SURVEY





Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2012 with funding from  
University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign

# Father Garraghan and “The Jolliet-Marquette Expedition, 1673”

*AUTHOR'S NOTE:*—*The following reply to Father Garraghan's critique was originally submitted for publication to THOUGHT. It was in the New York office of that quarterly on July 25, 1929, and thence it was sent “to the proper Associate Editor at once.” It failed to appear in the September issue of THOUGHT because, as the Managing Editor informed me, “it came in after our columns were filled, and the printer's dead-line had been passed.” Then, under date of September 18, a letter reached me from St. Ignatius College, Chicago, explaining that its writer was “directed to return . . . the manuscript” and was therefore sending it “under separate cover;” that “at the last meeting of the Editors of THOUGHT [which was held a month before, on August 15, as I learned incidentally later on] it was voted to print this manuscript in a subsequent issue of THOUGHT provided it was materially condensed;” and that, if I would “be so good as to comply with this condition and return the manuscript to” him in Chicago, he would “see that it appears in THOUGHT as soon as possible.”*

To comply with this condition was impossible. Father Garraghan's critique comprising forty pages (approximately 13,000 words) could not be reasonably and adequately dealt with in a reply more “materially condensed” than the one originally submitted. This explains why it has appeared, not in THOUGHT which (to quote one correspondent) was “the logical place for it,” but in THE FORTNIGHTLY REVIEW (1929, November and December, 1930, January). The present pamphlet contains the reply as originally submitted to THOUGHT and eventually published in THE FORTNIGHTLY REVIEW.

Quincey College, Quincey, Ill.,  
December 21, 1929.

Francis Borgia Steck, O.F.M.

It is delightful to observe what efforts are being made to invalidate the work recently published by me under the title *The Jolliet-Marquette Expedition, 1673*. The latest, appearing in *Thought*,<sup>1</sup> is by our foremost Jesuit historian, Rev. Gilbert J. Garraghan, S.J. That he and the Rev. editors devoted forty pages to the critique shows how earnestly they faced the task of refuting what even Fr. Garraghan concedes “is clearly written, copiously documented and bears on the face of it ample evidence of wide and scholarly research,”<sup>2</sup> and deserves commendation for “the wealth of documentation and the informing bibliographical surveys of the literature of the topics under discussion.”<sup>3</sup> In saying that my work “is largely controversial in purpose and tone,”<sup>4</sup> Fr. Garraghan doubtlessly wishes to say that the au-

thor investigates the *dicta* of earlier historians and writers concerning the 1673 expedition and furnishes arguments to show that these *dicta* are erroneous; wherefore “argumentative” would have been a more precise term than “controversial.” Fr. Garraghan's critique is divided into six parts. The first two deal almost exclusively with “New France in the Middle Seventeenth Century,” while the remaining four discuss the questions concerning the nature of the 1673 expedition, the leadership in the enterprise, and the existing narrative of it.

## I

In his discussion of the “long-continued and often vehement misunderstandings and disputes between the ecclesiastical powers . . . and the civil powers”<sup>5</sup> in New France, Fr. Garraghan conceals these highly important facts: that these “misunderstandings and disputes” occurred also before the days of Talon and Frontenac, that they

<sup>1</sup> The America Press, June, 1929, pp. 32-71.

<sup>2</sup> *Thought*, l.c., p. 33.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 71.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 33.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 34.

were occasioned by the control which the ecclesiastical powers had in course of time come to exercise in purely material and temporal affairs, and that of this control Louis XIV was determined to deprive them when, in 1663, he undertook to change the languishing colony on the St. Lawrence from a mission land into a royal colony. By failing to emphasize these facts and by speaking merely of "the civil powers . . . as represented by Talon, Frontenac and others,"<sup>6</sup> Fr. Garraghan from the start creates an erroneous impression.

It may be correct that Gallicanism connotes "the domination of the secular power over all departments of life, spiritual as well as temporal;" and that in the passage culled from Talon's instructions "is enunciated the central dogma of Gallicanism;"<sup>7</sup> but whether it was such complete domination that Louis XIV purposed when he approved Talon's instructions, is open to question. It would have been better if Fr. Garraghan had examined the entire body of the instructions and given his readers at least the paragraph containing the passage which he quotes. This paragraph reads:

"To this end, the Sieur Talon shall be informed that those who have given the most trustworthy and the most disinterested accounts of that country, have always said that the Jesuits, whose piety and zeal have contributed much toward drawing to it the people who are there at present, have assumed an authority there which exceeds the limits of their real power, which ought to regard only the consciences. To maintain themselves in it, it pleased them well to name the Bishop of Petrée<sup>8</sup> for exercising there the episcopal functions, because being in complete dependence on them; and even till now, they have either named the

<sup>6</sup> *Ibidem.*

<sup>7</sup> *Ibidem.*

<sup>8</sup> The title under which Msgr. de Laval, on December 8, 1658, was consecrated bishop in *partibus infidelium* and appointed vicar apostolic of New France. See Aug. Gosselin, *Vie de Mgr. De Laval*, Vol. I, Chapters 8 and 9.

governors for the king in that country or they have employed every possible means to have those recalled who had been chosen for that office without their concurrence; wherefore, since it is absolutely necessary to keep in a just balance the temporal authority, which resides in the person of the king and in those who represent him, and the spiritual, which resides in the person of said bishop and the Jesuits, even though in a manner that the latter be inferior to the other, the first thing to which the Sieur Talon shall well attend and concerning which it is well that on departing from here he have almost full information, is to know perfectly in what position those two authorities are at present and in what position they ought naturally to be. To attain this, it will be necessary that he see here the Jesuit Fathers who have been in that country and who have all the correspondence with it, as also the procurator general and the Sieur Villeray, who are the two leading members of the sovereign council established at Quebec and who are said to be wholly devoted to the Jesuits, from whom he shall gather what they can know about it, without however disclosing his intentions."<sup>9</sup>

The remaining twenty paragraphs of Talon's instructions deal with the material development of New France, excepting the sixth,<sup>10</sup> which discusses the case of the unfortunate ex-Governor Mezy and shows plainly that, instead of desiring to trespass on the rights of the spiritual authorities, Louis XIV meant to protect these rights and bring to trial the ex-governor who had trespassed on them. Furthermore, later instructions of the king to his colonial officials in New France seem to indicate that he aimed merely at full and exclusive control of civil and temporal affairs, intending to leave purely spiritual and ecclesiastical matters in the hands of the bishop and his clergy. Thus, for instance, Sieur Gaudais, sent to New France as royal inspector in

<sup>9</sup> Pierre Clement, *Lettres, Instructions et Memoirs de Colbert*, Vol. III<sup>2</sup>, pp. 389-390.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 391.

1669, was told not to meddle with the affairs of the bishop; while that same year Governor Courcelles was advised "to act with much prudence and circumspection" in his dealings with the spiritual authority.<sup>11</sup>

As may be gathered from their *Relations*, the Jesuits at the time were satisfied with conditions after 1663. On November 8, 1665, their superior at Quebec wrote: "Monsieur Talon made it evident at the outset that the King loves this country, and has great plans for its upbuilding—convincing us by his verbal assurances to that effect, and also much more, by his personal merits, which cause us already to taste the sweets of a superintendence so guided by reason, and of a policy in all respects Christian."<sup>12</sup> Two years later the superior had this to report concerning the material prosperity of New France: "The accomplishment of all this, at his Majesty's expense, obliges us to acknowledge all the results of his royal kindness, by vows and prayers which we constantly address to Heaven, and with which our churches re-echo, for the welfare of his sacred person. To him alone is due the whole glory of having put this country in such a condition that, if the course of events in the future correspond to that of the past two years, we shall fail to recognize Canada, and shall see our forests, which have already greatly receded, changing into towns and provinces which may some day be not unlike those of France."<sup>13</sup> When, in 1668, Talon departed for France, the Jesuit superior at Quebec testified that Talon "has not ceased to exert every effort for the general good of this country, for the cultivation of the fields, the discovery of mines, the promotion of commerce, and for every advantage that can conduce to the establishment and enlargement of this colony. Consequently, we would regret much more his return to France, if we did not have as his successor Monsieur Bouter-

oue who is all that we could wish for to make good the loss."<sup>14</sup> It is well known how vigorously Talon carried out his instructions and how he thereby came in conflict with the Vicar Apostolic of Quebec and the Jesuits. Still, when he returned to New France, Father Claude Dablon, recently appointed superior of the Jesuits there, wrote of "the joy afforded us all by his safe arrival."<sup>15</sup> And when, late in 1672, the Great Intendant and Governor Courcelles left for France, Dablon wrote: "We cannot without some grief watch the vessels set sail from our roadstead, since they bear away, in the persons of Monsieur de Courcelles and Monsieur Talon, what was most precious to us. We shall ever remember the former for having so effectively reduced the Iroquois to submission, and we shall ever wish for the latter's return to give the finishing stroke to the undertakings begun by him so greatly for the benefit of this country."<sup>16</sup>

From these statements one may legitimately conclude that the Jesuits were not dissatisfied with the policy pursued by the civil authorities and that "the main issue that put the Bishop of Quebec and with him the Jesuits in opposition to the representatives of Louis XIV in Canada," was not, as Fr. Garraghan states, "the supremacy of the Church in ecclesiastical affairs,"<sup>17</sup> but the supremacy of the Church in civil and material affairs, as had obtained in New France before 1663. The supremacy of the Church in ecclesiastical matters was not questioned at all; nor did the State "claim supremacy over the Church in ecclesiastical affairs"<sup>18</sup> beyond what prevailed in the mother country at the time by mutual agreement between the Holy See and the French government.

Consequently, Fr. Garraghan misrepresents matters when he reproduces an entire paragraph from *The Jolliet-*

<sup>11</sup> Steck, *The Jolliet-Marquette Expedition, 1673*, Quincy, Ill., 1928, pp. 78-79.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 59.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 65.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 75-76.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 80.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 98.

<sup>17</sup> *Thought, l.c.*, p. 36.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 34, note 4.

*Marquette Expedition, 1673* in order to let his readers decide whether "the implications of Dr. Steck's words" suggest "that expediency rather than Catholic principle should have guided the Bishop and the Jesuits in the crisis."<sup>19</sup> If the readers of *Thought* will take up my book and carefully read what precedes and follows the paragraph adduced by Fr. Garraghan, they will assuredly not make out of it what he intimates. They will notice immediately that Fr. Garraghan errs when he applies pronouncements of the nineteenth century to politico-ecclesiastical conditions obtaining two centuries earlier. In the days of Talon and Frontenac there was no question of any abstract "Catholic principle," things being in a state of transition, and consequently no question at all of "expediency" in the sense that Fr. Garraghan's stricture implies. It was, therefore, quite proper and fully orthodox for the author to ask "whether it would not have been more practical to let things take their course" and coöperate with the civil authorities, as the Franciscans at the time did, instead of pulling "against the stream" and thereby needlessly nourishing those "long-continued and often vehement misunderstandings and disputes."<sup>20</sup> The further reference at this point to "a strange, if unintentional, perversion of the facts"<sup>21</sup> is, like the foregoing, merely another instance of picking something out of the text that the text does not contain. For this reason it may be dismissed without comment. So also the matter that Fr. Garraghan "takes up with reluctance."<sup>22</sup> One more intimately acquainted with the history of New France, including that of the Mississippi Valley, from the days of Frontenac to the suppression of the Society of Jesus, will readily under-

stand why, "when Frontenac disappeared from the scene," nay, even earlier, "there was no longer question of rivalry and conflict."<sup>23</sup>

Before passing to the next part of the critique, a word is in order on what is termed "a curious translation,"<sup>24</sup> of Lalement's letter. It was well for Fr. Garraghan to quote only the final sentence of the letter. But here is the entire paragraph: "Our Fathers are at peace with those not of the Society: with the ecclesiastical powers, *eminently*; with the secular powers, *seemingly*; as far as lies in us, *truly*; as far as lies in them, *doubtfully*: for they show that it is their desire to curb [depriment] the Jesuits, who are too powerful in these parts and who, they say, have for forty years held sway in these parts. For this reason among others, it is believed, the Franciscan Fathers have been called hither. Be that as it may, we have received those Fathers and have shown them and will show them every sort of courtesy; nor will we on that account have ourselves curbed [depresso], but assisted."<sup>25</sup> Interpreting the final sentence in the light of what precedes, and noticing that "*depresso*" and "*depriment*" are derived from the same verb "*deprimere*," i.e. "to curb," readers will not find the translation of the final sentence so curious as Fr. Garraghan would have them believe.

## II

In the second part of his critique Fr. Garraghan writes: "Two reckless accusations in particular Frontenac felt himself moved to make against the Jesuits: that they engaged in the fur trade, and that they sought to usurp the civil functions of the state. Dr. Steck, one regrets to say, has allowed himself to echo both."<sup>26</sup> The reader will notice that nothing is said of any "reckless accusations" made by Talon and Courcelles, whose terms of office alone, to the exclusion of Frontenac's,

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 37.

<sup>20</sup> See in this connection Fr. Garraghan's interesting concession in note 35 on page 48. Of course, he only quotes Rochemonteix; but he does so without censure, apparently because he accepts his opinion.

<sup>21</sup> *Thought*, l.c., p. 38.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 39.

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 40.

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 41, note 19.

<sup>25</sup> Steck, *op. cit.*, p. 91.

<sup>26</sup> *Thought*, l.c., p. 42.

were specifically treated by the author of *The Jolliet-Marquette Expedition, 1673*.

With regard to the fur trade, Fr. Garraghan culls from the work just cited three sentences to show how its author "has allowed himself to echo" Frontenac's (*sic!*) accusations. But by detaching these sentences from their context and confusing Frontenac's accusations with Talon's suspicions, the matter is completely misrepresented. Moreover, I nowhere claim that the Jesuits *engaged* in the fur trade, but that Talon suspected them of seeking to *control* the fur trade. That his suspicions "were not entirely unfounded" is based on far more evidence than the mere words of Dablon which Fr. Garraghan advances to the exclusion of all the other evidence.<sup>27</sup> Sometimes an action speaks more loudly and clearly than words; and it is for the historian to interpret not only words, but also actions in the light of other historical facts. Parkman's eulogy, as quoted by Fr. Garraghan,<sup>28</sup> is not only "a fine tribute" but also a just one, although the eulogy appears rather modified by that portion of Parkman's observation which Fr. Garraghan omits and by another statement of Parkman on the same page<sup>29</sup> which Fr. Garraghan overlooks.

As to seeking "to usurp the civil functions of the state," which Fr. Garraghan identifies with a "pursuit of land-grabbing" or an aim "at some sort of civil or political control of the western regions"<sup>30</sup>—here again he not only misrepresents matters by detaching sentences to support his contention, but, what is worse, draws from the text what the text does not contain. From a fair and impartial reading of the text one can gather no more than what Fr. Garraghan himself admits: "What really may have happened was that the

Jesuits sought to occupy the western country for missionary purposes, but under the civil authority of Quebec, which of course would have been a perfectly legitimate procedure."<sup>31</sup> How desperately they fought to retain "the western country for missionary purposes" to the exclusion of other equally zealous missionaries is not discussed in the work which Fr. Garraghan criticises, although this undeniable fact<sup>32</sup> was employed (and justly so) by its author as a clue to interpreting facts directly connected with the 1673 expedition. Whether or not the western country would eventually be "under the civil authority of Quebec," Talon was not so very far from the truth when, with others in New France, he suspected the Jesuits of designing to occupy and develop the new West into so-called reductions, such as they had in Paraguay.<sup>33</sup> If they succeeded, he feared the new West would not be "under the civil authority of Quebec." To secure it, however, from the start for the civil authority, *i.e.*, to secure in the new West what he was gradually securing in the East, he organized and supervised the westward expeditions.

Anyone who carefully regards the circumstances that attended the expeditions of Saint-Lusson and La Salle will find these circumstances amply sufficient to warrant the conclusion that, by organizing the two expeditions, Talon intended to safeguard the interests of the king in the impending work

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>28</sup> See Steck, *op. cit.*, pp. 125, 144-145.  
<sup>29</sup> *Thought, l.c.*, p. 46.  
<sup>30</sup> Francis Parkman, *The Jesuits in North America* (Ed. 1896), p. 365, note 1. See also Parkman, *The Old Regime* (Ed. 196), pp. 378-380.

<sup>31</sup> At an earlier date the Jesuits had contemplated such reductions for New France. See Rochemonteix, S.J., *Les Jésuites et la Nouvelle-France au XVII Siecle*, Vol. I, pp. 384-388.

<sup>32</sup> *Thought, l.c.*, p. 46.

of territorial expansion by impressing on the missionaries in the West "that exploring and exploiting new territories belonged exclusively to the temporal authorities and that their [the Jesuits'] coöperation would be welcomed only so long as they were willing to recognize this principle."<sup>34</sup> Certainly, before the intendance of Talon the Jesuits had been, to quote Fr. Garraghan, "the government's accredited agents in negotiating treaties with the Indians," and thereby had gained considerable "prestige and authority."<sup>35</sup> Having subsequently lost this agency, and with it the "prestige and authority" in eastern New France, the civil government assuming control of such matters, they designed to secure it in the West, where as yet no other Order had founded missions for the Indians. To thwart this design, which was directly opposed to his instructions, Talon undertook to have the West explored and exploited under the auspices of the civil government; while later on Governor Frontenac and the Bishop of Quebec agreed to have other missionaries share the new mission field with the Jesuits. In short, Fr. Garraghan seems not to have studied the history of New France very closely and not to have read *The Joliet-Marquette Expedition, 1673* with a sufficiently open mind; otherwise he would scarcely find it "regrettable that with all his wide and scholarly grasp of individual facts Dr. Steck has not given us a really accurate and informing picture of Canada in the mid-seventeenth century."<sup>36</sup>

### III

Perhaps the most amusing part of Fr. Garraghan's critique is the third, on the nature of the 1673 expedition. As to whether it was a "discovery" of the Mississippi, he writes: "If one is bent on being literal and meticulous in the matter, one may perhaps see in the terminology 'a violation of English idiom and the rules of sound logic' and even historical inconsistency; but the American historical scholarship con-

tinuing in the main to support it one need have no scruples in using it freely,"<sup>37</sup> i.e., in designating the 1673 expedition a "discovery" of the river. Surely, his readers must have smiled when they came to this statement: "If one wishes to start a movement in favor of restricting the title of discoverer of the Mississippi to some or other of the Spanish conquistadores, one is of course at perfect liberty to do so; but until the movement assumes the proportions of an authoritative dictum of historical scholarship on the point at issue, one may be pardoned for clinging to the established terminology." To be sure, "one may be pardoned," if one is under the impression that the "established terminology"<sup>38</sup> is by that fact also the correct terminology, just as Fr. Garraghan "has no hesitation in using the term Recollect,"<sup>39</sup> even though this name, formerly employed to designate one of the four families of the Franciscan Order, was officially abolished in 1897, thirty-two years ago. Moreover, it may be a long time before "the movement assumes the proportions of an authoritative dictum of historical scholarship," especially if prominent representatives of historical scholarship, because their own interests are involved, refuse to join and endeavor to thwart the movement, preferring not to be "literal and meticulous in the matter" of correct and accurate terminology and continuing to "have no scruples in using" a term for the 1673 expedition that is idiomatically, logically, and even historically erroneous.

Amusing is also the criticism of the "curious contention of Dr. Steck's, namely, that the term 'discovery' precludes all previous knowledge of the existence of the thing discovered."<sup>40</sup> To see that it is neither "a curious contention" nor "a purely arbitrary restriction of the term in question," one need but consult the International Dictionary, for instance, according to which "to discover" means "to obtain

<sup>34</sup> Steck, *op. cit.*, p. 125.

<sup>35</sup> *Thought*, l.c., p. 48.

<sup>36</sup> *Thought*, l.c., p. 50.

<sup>37</sup> *Ibidem*.

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 51.

<sup>39</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 39, note 13.

<sup>40</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 51-52.

for the first time sight or knowledge of, as of a thing existing already, but not known or perceived." Again, whoever reads the interpretation of this definition in *The Jolliet-Marquette Expedition, 1673*<sup>41</sup> will surely disagree with Fr. Garraghan's statement that the author's restriction of the term "has no warrant, as far as can be gathered, in dictionary or scientific usage."<sup>42</sup> Of course, "scientific usage" of this as of any other term is presumably in accord with the dictionary's definition. Hence, "if one is bent on being literal and meticulous"—the pity is, some writers are not so bent—then the Jolliet party of 1673 must certainly "be denied the title of discoverers of the Mississippi," because, for one reason, "they were previously aware of the existence of the great waterway and perhaps even of its approximate location."<sup>43</sup>

#### IV

The chain of reasoning in the fifth chapter of the book he seeks to discredit must have convinced even Fr. Garraghan; for he concedes that the author's "contention, namely, that Jolliet and not Marquette was the leader of the expedition, is entirely in accordance with the facts."<sup>44</sup> Then, it must have demanded considerable courage to admit that Father Charlevoix, who wrote nearly two centuries ago and presumably had free access to the Jesuit sources, notably those in Paris and Quebec, "was mistaken" in this as "in other particulars regarding Marquette."<sup>45</sup> Still, Fr. Garraghan holds that Marquette was "the virtual or moral head of the expedition and as such made the greater contribution to

its success."<sup>46</sup> The irrelevancy, not to say futility, of such reasoning to save Marquette's fame is apparent.<sup>47</sup> Nor was the 1673 expedition on the part of the civil government in any way whatever "a joint achievement of the two explorers."<sup>48</sup> The civil government did not even know that Marquette had accompanied Jolliet, until it leaked out a few years later.<sup>49</sup> Before commenting on what Fr. Garraghan writes concerning Marquette's place in history, another quite unexpected concession of his should be noticed; namely, that "the purpose of [the Manitoumie maps] seems to have been to feature and capitalize in the interest of the missions the Jesuit share in the expedition" of 1673; and that these Manitoumie maps together with Dablon's letter of October 24, 1674 seem to show that the Jesuits "exaggerated their share and even claimed for the Order the exclusive credit" of the undertaking.<sup>50</sup> Indeed, "the whole thing is an enigma," to quote Fr. Garraghan, and it will remain an enigma until one faces the known facts boldly, weighs them carefully, interprets them impartially, and presents them accurately and precisely—a task which the present writer undertook to perform, but by which, it would seem, he gave offense.

To whatever agency of propaganda one ascribes "Marquette's place in history," the fact remains that it far exceeds the bounds of actual achievements, by which, of course, his place has to be determined. Consequently, the place he holds in American history to-day is by no means "a matter of legitimate pride to Catholic historians,"<sup>51</sup> who in presenting Catholic his-

<sup>41</sup> Steck, *op. cit.*, pp. 193-194. The reader may consult also the state of question, as defined by the author; *ibid.*, pp. 200-202.

<sup>42</sup> *Thought*, *l.c.*, p. 52.—Did space permit, it would be highly interesting and illuminating to comment on the cases here (*p. 52*) enumerated by Fr. Garraghan.

<sup>43</sup> *Thought*, *l.c.*, p. 52.

<sup>44</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 42.

<sup>45</sup> *Ibid.*—The first edition of *Histoire et Description Général de la Nouvelle France* by P. Fr. X. Charlevoix, S.J., appeared at Paris in 1744.

<sup>46</sup> *Thought*, *l.c.*, p. 53.

<sup>47</sup> Steck, *op. cit.*, pp. 254-255.

<sup>48</sup> *Thought*, *l. c.*, p. 53. — "Explorers" (sic!). Perhaps inadvertently Fr. Garraghan is "literal and meticulous in the matter" of terminology.

<sup>49</sup> Steck, *op. cit.*, p. 232.

<sup>50</sup> *Thought*, *l.c.*, p. 54, note 45.—Fortunately, these statements were not by the present writer.

<sup>51</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 56.—Fr. Garraghan thinks that "Marquette's fame is not at all conditioned by any theory we may hold as to his share in the expedition of 1673." (*Ibid.*, pp. 54-55.)

tory scientifically are governed by the same laws of historical research and criticism that govern non-Catholic historians. The facts are these: Marquette served as missionary for the comparatively brief space of six and one-half years;<sup>52</sup> he was not, like Father Allouez, S.J., and so many others, a pioneer and founder of missions, barring perhaps Mission St. Ignace, the site for which Dablon had previously selected;<sup>53</sup> Marquette's "previous study of the problems involved"<sup>54</sup> in the rumored Great Water were anticipated and shared by Allouez; "his widespread experience picked up in years of missionary travel" was gathered, to be exact, between October, 1668 and May, 1673—four and one-half years;<sup>55</sup> "his knowledge of the native languages" was not so exceptional, for instance, as to prevent Allouez from composing for him a prayerbook in the language of the Illinois;<sup>56</sup> "his unusually forceful personality" did not suffice to control the Indians at Chequamegon Bay and unite them for protection against the Sioux uprising, he being forced to accompany them on their flight to Sault Sainte Marie.<sup>57</sup> Of course, "his priestly character with its peculiar appeal to the Indian" was a qualification; but this all the Jesuit missionaries shared with him; nor was it proof, in the case of Marquette, against the ferocity of Indian tribes with whom the French had not previously come in contact. What saved the Frenchmen in 1673, when they reached the Arkansas region, was not the priestly character of Marquette, but the timely presentation of the calumet.<sup>58</sup> As historian in search for the truth, Fr. Garraghan surely took all these and numerous other circumstances into account when determining

"Marquette's place in history." If he did, then the place he assigns to Marquette is as much an enigma as the Manitoumie maps and the letter of Dablon.

## V

Real credit is due Fr. Garraghan for not having confused, as is usually done, the *Récit* or narrative of the 1673 expedition with Marquette's *Journal* of the second visit to the Illinois. This highly important point seems at last definitely settled.<sup>59</sup> On the other hand, Fr. Garraghan is entirely mistaken when he says that the fact "that no MS. of the document exists in Marquette's own handwriting" is offered as an argument against the authenticity of the *Récit*.<sup>60</sup> He must surely have noticed that this fact is used by the author merely to justify in part his inquiry into the authenticity, and this in view of the further fact that for so many years the Montreal MS. of the *Récit* was erroneously claimed to be in Marquette's own handwriting.<sup>61</sup> This latter fact and circumstance he leaves out of account when he refers to the four Gospels and the Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius.<sup>62</sup> No claim as to handwriting is ever made regarding these, as was for so long a time made regarding the Montreal MS.

Erroneous is also his following statement: "When, however, we turn to the map we find that all the lettering, with two or three [three, to be exact] items excepted, evidently later additions, is in Roman capitals and none of it in cursive hand."<sup>63</sup> Most probably Fr. Garraghan did not consult the revised edition of *The Jolliet-Marquette Expedition, 1673*, enriched with maps and documents.<sup>64</sup> In this edition

<sup>52</sup> Steck, *op. cit.*, p. 260.

<sup>53</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 145.

<sup>54</sup> *Thought*, *l. c.*, p. 56.

<sup>55</sup> Steck, *op. cit.*, pp. 109-110, 114.

<sup>56</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 250.

<sup>57</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 113-114.

<sup>58</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 161.

<sup>59</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 261-262.

<sup>60</sup> *Thought*, *l. c.*, p. 57.

<sup>61</sup> Steck, *op. cit.*, p. 281.

<sup>62</sup> *Thought*, *l. c.*, p. 57, note 47.

<sup>63</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 60.

<sup>64</sup> It seemed strange to the writer from the start that Fr. Garraghan noticed only the unadorned paper edition of the book, published in June, 1927, ignoring completely the more elaborate edition published in 1928. He surely knew of this later edition.

he would have found two photographic reproductions of what is more accurately termed the map of "Jolliet-Marquette, 1672-1673."<sup>65</sup> On the first of these, No. 29,<sup>66</sup> the "two or three items excepted" (i.e., those not in Roman capitals) happen to be in Marquette's handwriting and are, therefore, not "evidently later additions." These appear only on the map in its mutilated form (photographic reproduction, No. 30) as published by Thwaites in the 59th volume of *The Jesuit Relations*. This mutilation of the original map, made after 1852, whereby the handwriting of Marquette was completely destroyed, is really another of the many enigmas connected with the 1673 expedition.

Fr. Garraghan is again in error when he writes, perhaps unintentionally, that "Frontenac and Jolliet 'were well pleased that Father Marquette should be of the party'"<sup>67</sup> in 1673. The *Récit*, which he quotes, says nothing at all about Jolliet at this point, but cites Talon with Frontenac as being thus pleased.

It may be well to point out that Fr. Garraghan leaves entirely unexplained the significant fact that Marquette, in his *Journal*, does not call the Mississippi *Rivière de la Conception*, as in the *Récit* he is supposed to have promised. Then, what Dablon meant by "as one can judge from that" ("comme on peut juger par là") is by no means so evident as Fr. Garraghan would have his readers believe.<sup>68</sup> The French idiom seems to militate against his interpretation. Having the force of a demonstrative pronoun and adverb, "par là" may quite well point to what follows and not only to what precedes, as was the opinion of Thwaites, whom Fr. Garraghan incidentally mentions in the footnote. The reader may judge, then, how fair it is to designate this interpre-

tation of the passage as "typical of the author's frequent capricious and arbitrary method of dealing with his material."<sup>69</sup>

In Dablon's letter of October 25, 1678, Fr. Garraghan finds a statement from which, he thinks, "the conclusion would seem inevitable that Dablon had in his possession a memoir or narrative by Marquette of the journey of 1673."<sup>70</sup> In the first place, he overlooks the circumstance that this letter was written in 1678, five years after the expedition, and sent with the *Rélation* which Dablon had prepared for that year.<sup>71</sup> Then, if Dablon had a narrative, sent to him by Marquette, in addition to Marquette's *Journal*, he would not have said that he got it all together "as well as I could," thereby plainly suggesting difficulties he had in getting the memoirs of Marquette. Again, it must be remembered that part of the *Rélation* of 1678<sup>72</sup> is Allouez's account of his own voyage to the Illinois and of what he therein terms "the perfect establishment of a mission"<sup>73</sup> among the Illinois. So, when Dablon spoke of "the establishment of the mission of the Illinois," he may have referred to the portion of the 1678 *Rélation* by Allouez, all the more so since Dablon

<sup>65</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 61.—In footnote 52, on page 65, Fr. Garraghan adduces "a supplementary instance of Dr. Steck's misreading of documents." This time Fr. Garraghan is substantially correct and the author readily admits his mistake. At the time when, as is his custom, he checked up Winsor's statement and found it to be a misreading of the document in Margry, he forgot to make the correction in his filed notes. Thus, quite naturally, Winsor's erroneous reading of Margry crept into the book. But it is not very serious, because, no matter what Frontenac understood Jolliet to say, we have Dablon's and Jolliet's precise declaration that Marquette had copies of Jolliet's account of the 1673 expedition. As to the above mistake, the author is grateful to Fr. Garraghan for the correction and assures him that the respective note has been corrected accordingly.

<sup>66</sup> *Thought*, l. c., pp. 65-66.

<sup>67</sup> See *Rélations Inédites de la Nouvelle-France in Missions du Canada* (Paris, 1861, Douniol Ed.), Vol. II, p. 194.

<sup>68</sup> *Ibid.*, Vol. II, pp. 242-329 (306-317).

<sup>69</sup> See Montreal MS., p. 59. Allouez's account takes up pages 52-60 of this MS., the first part of which embodies the *Récit*.

<sup>65</sup> See Wisconsin Historical Society, *Proceedings*, 1906, p. 183.

<sup>66</sup> It serves as frontispiece to Shea's *Discovery and Exploration of the Mississippi Valley* (Redfield, 1852).

<sup>67</sup> *Thought*, l. c., p. 62.

<sup>68</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 60.

says "of the" and not of *his* (*i.e.*, Marquette's) establishment. Fr. Garraghan next quotes "Dablon's letters of October 25, 1674, to the Father General, one in Latin and the other in French."<sup>74</sup> He admits that, when Dablon here refers to a copy of the narrative "as being in Marquette's possession," the original of it having been "lost in an accident to Jolliet," he does not say "in so many words, that it was Marquette's own"<sup>75</sup> narrative. So this second reference of Dablon, made in 1674, is just as ambiguous as the one he made in 1678.<sup>76</sup> On the other hand, what Dablon promised to obtain "next year from Father Marquette" is very clearly and precisely stated in the "Relation" of August 1, 1674. He promised to get what, he says, Marquette had; namely, "a copy of that one which has been lost" by Jolliet in the accident at Lachine Rapids<sup>77</sup> and which Jolliet declared with equal clearness and precision was his (Jolliet's) own narrative.<sup>78</sup> Having left this clear and precise statement of Dablon and of Jolliet entirely unnoticed, and taken into account only the two ambiguous statements of Dablon, Fr. Garraghan nevertheless rejects it as "a perfectly

<sup>74</sup> To be exact, the Latin letter, dated October 25, 1674, was addressed to the Father General; the French letter, however, dated October 24 (not 25), 1674, was addressed to the Provincial in Paris. For the first, see Rochemonteix, *op. cit.*, Vol. III, p. 11, footnote. For the second, see *Rélations Inédites (ut supra)*, Vol. II, pp. 3-15.

<sup>75</sup> *Thought, l. c.*, p. 66.

<sup>76</sup> The same is true of Marquette's statement in his *Journal* as to what he sent to Dablon in the way of an account of the 1673 expedition. Fr. Garraghan does not see any ambiguity in Marquette's statement because he does not regard it in the light of other facts. If Marquette, for instance, sent his own narrative, what about Dablon's promise made so shortly before and presumably kept by him when he wrote to Marquette? To ignore Dablon's promise and then reject the writer's explanation of Marquette's statement as "purely fictitious," does not impress one very favorably. (See *Thought, l. c.*, pp. 63-64.)

<sup>77</sup> Steck, *op. cit.*, p. 288. See also reproduction of document, No. 2.

<sup>78</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 290.

gratuitous assumption to suppose that the narrative to which Dablon refers as lost in an accident to Jolliet, and of which a copy remains in Marquette's hands, was the journal of Jolliet.<sup>79</sup> The author of *The Jolliet-Marquette Expedition, 1673* proceeded otherwise in his investigation. He considered every possible circumstance connected with the authenticity of the *Récit*. Hence it is hardly fair to say that his "eagerness to press every point in favor of his thesis carried him time and again beyond the limits set by sound historical criticism."<sup>80</sup> He may have eagerly pressed "every point in favor of his thesis;" but certain it is that he did not purposely garble, distort, or suppress anything.

What Fr. Garraghan mainly objects to is the author's statement "that the impossibility of Marquette having written the *Récit* as it exists to-day 'has been demonstrated'" and "proved to a certainty."<sup>81</sup> It would have been better, though quite destructive of his own contention, if Fr. Garraghan had laid greater stress on the parallelisms we find in the *Récit* and the '*Relation*',<sup>82</sup> instead of disposing of this most damaging evidence in a mere footnote.<sup>83</sup> Apparently, he disposed of it thus because he himself concedes in the beginning of his critique that "in the matter of textual criticism particularly Dr. Steck achieves some happy results."<sup>84</sup> As a matter of fact, the results achieved are so happy that they "demonstrate" to a finality what the "instances" of internal evidence, "too numerous to mention,"<sup>85</sup> very strongly indicate; namely, that "the author of the narrative as it exists in Thevenot's *Récueil* and in the Montreal and Paris manuscripts can not be Marquette."<sup>86</sup>

But who is the author, if not Marquette? On this point there is no cer-

<sup>79</sup> *Thought, l. c.*, p. 66.

<sup>80</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 68.

<sup>81</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 58; also pp. 57, 68, 69.

<sup>82</sup> Steck, *op. cit.*, pp. 297-306.

<sup>83</sup> *Thought, l. c.*, p. 58, note.

<sup>84</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 33.

<sup>85</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 61.

<sup>86</sup> Steck, *op. cit.*, p. 306.

tainty. All that can be offered is *an hypothesis*, resting for support on other known facts and always remaining more or less probable. As "it must be allowed that a certain air of mystery attended the circumstances under which the *Récit* first saw publication,"<sup>87</sup> there is "great probability . . . that in its present form" the *Récit* "is in substance" what Marquette had in his possession and in October, 1674, sent to Quebec; namely, "Jolliet's journal," sent to Dablon by Marquette (who hoped it would satisfy the wishes of his Superior) and eventually "recast and amplified by Dablon with the aid of other sources which he had at his disposal."<sup>88</sup> Indeed, the numerous circumstances pointing to Dablon as the author of the *Récit* seem to have impressed Fr. Garraghan as they impressed the author whom he censures; for they elicited from him, finally, this remarkable concession: "As a matter of fact, as students of the 'Relations' well know,<sup>89</sup> these reports were frequently edited by Superiors for publication, a process that involved not merely omissions or additions but also, so it would appear,<sup>90</sup> actual alterations of the text. It is not at all unlikely<sup>91</sup> that Marquette's narrative of the 1673 expedition was thus dealt with by Father Dablon, and in this sense one may maintain with some show of probability<sup>92</sup> that the *Récit* in its present form is not the missionary's [i.e., Marquette's] composition."<sup>93</sup>

As the reader will notice, after stating his major proposition with laudable clearness and accuracy, Fr. Garraghan refuses to weigh the most telling facts when stating his minor proposition;

<sup>87</sup> *Thought, l. c.*, p. 68.

<sup>88</sup> Steck, *op. cit.*, p. 310.

<sup>89</sup> But do not always admit so readily as Fr. Garraghan does.

<sup>90</sup> Especially from the *Rélation* of 1672-1673, as published in the Thwaites edition, Vol. 57 (pp. 33-313) and Vol. 58 (pp. 19-89).

<sup>91</sup> But from the parallelisms it is certain.

<sup>92</sup> Rather, with certainty, on the strength of the parallelisms.

<sup>93</sup> *Thought, l. c.*, p. 68.

wherefore his conclusion cannot be correct. Moreover, he confuses what the author of *The Jolliet-Marquette Expedition, 1673* has "demonstrated" as certain with what he has proposed as probable—the *conclusion* that Marquette could not have written the narrative as it exists to-day with the *theory* that it may have been written or "edited" by Dablon. Concerning the authorship of the *Récit*, Fr. Garraghan concedes much and refutes nothing of the evidence produced in support of the author's conclusion and theory.

## VI

In the last part of his critique, Fr. Garraghan defends "Dablon's honor and good name as they appear in the records." He will certainly agree, however, that the share which Dablon had, as Superior, in "editing" the *Récit* and embodying it in the *Rélation* of 1677-1678; that the letters he wrote in October, 1674; that the mystifying circumstances attending the "edition" of it, especially the strange disappearance of the original in Marquette's handwriting, whereas the *Journal* of Marquette was preserved in the original, and the equally strange disappearance of the copies of Jolliet's account; that Dablon's clear statement concerning the whereabouts of these copies of Jolliet's account and his promise to get these copies from Marquette; that his failure ever to speak distinctly and explicitly of a narrative written by Marquette; that Jolliet's peculiar attitude toward the Jesuits after the appearance of Thevenot's *Récueil* in 1681;—that these outstanding facts ought to be disposed of before the theory they bolster is brushed aside as carrying "on the face of it its own refutation."<sup>94</sup> Had he offered an interpretation of these facts, instead of terming them "the merest assumptions," his defense of "Dablon's honor and good name" would doubtlessly carry greater weight. Fr. Garraghan thinks he finds the author of the theory regarding Dablon "off his guard"

<sup>94</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 70.

when he (the author) "instinctively rejects . . . a certain supposition, . . . seeing that it 'would reflect unfavorably on both Dablon and Marquette.'"<sup>95</sup> In the paragraph where the author advances this "certain supposition" it has an entirely different meaning and import<sup>96</sup> from what Fr. Garraghan intimates and it in no way at all contravenes the author's theory regarding Dablon's authorship of the *Récit*. Here, as repeatedly elsewhere in his critique, Fr. Garraghan conveniently misreads the text.

The concluding paragraph of the critique is quite superfluous. For one thing, it will not serve to erase the impression that Fr. Garraghan was "singularly lacking in a sense of humor" by undertaking "to debate these rather academic issues on other than scientific grounds."<sup>97</sup> What still remains a matter of honest and sincere expectation on the part of the author is a refutation written, in the light of solid facts and along the lines of sound historical criticism, as impartially and dispassionately as he wrote *The Joliet-Marquette Expedition, 1673*. The non-appearance of such a refutation may encourage him sufficiently to cite a matter concerning the genuineness of the *Récit* that will cause even greater astonishment than was caused by what

he has already "demonstrated" concerning its *authenticity*. So far, two noteworthy attempts have been made to refute his work on the 1673 expedition—one by Miss Agnes Repplier in her *Père Marquette*,<sup>98</sup> the other by Fr. Garraghan in the current issue of *Thought*. To the latter attempt the *Catholic Daily Tribune* for May 23, 1929, refers as follows: "In *Thought*, the Jesuit quarterly, the veteran historian of St. Louis University, Gilbert J. Garraghan, S.J., tries to refute the propositions advanced by Father Steck." Whether he succeeded in his attempt the readers of *Thought* may now decide for themselves. The writer of these lines is certain, however, that what he wrote "will not be interpreted," to quote Fr. Garraghan, "as implying anything else than a desire to ascertain and present what he conceives to be the actual truth as to the points at issue."<sup>99</sup> In fact, had there been reason for him to fear a different interpretation, he would have most assuredly left the critique entirely unnoticed, hoping that someone else would take upon himself the unwelcome burden of a reply.

<sup>95</sup> *Idem*.

<sup>96</sup> Steck, *op. cit.*, pp. 305-306.

<sup>97</sup> *Thought*, *l. c.*, p. 71.

<sup>98</sup> For the writer's critique of this volume see THE FORTNIGHTLY REVIEW, Vol. XXXVI (1929), nos. 4, 5, and 6. This critique has been reprinted and published in pamphlet form. The copies still available may be had for a two-cent stamp each from the author of this paper.

<sup>99</sup> *Thought*, *l. c.*, p. 70-71.









UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS-URBANA



3 0112 044332291